



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,676	05/09/2006	Yuchi Taneya	060297	3882
23850	7590	04/21/2008	EXAMINER	
KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP			BATISTA, MARCOS	
1420 K Street, N.W.				
Suite 400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			4134	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/578,676	TANEYA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARCOS BATISTA	4134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 May 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/09/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too lengthy. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakamura et al. (US 20040023685 A1).

Consider claim 1, Nakamura discloses an openable and closable mobile communication device (1) having a first display screen (5) and a second display screen (20) that differ in screen size, comprising (see par. 0107 lines 3-5): a storage unit (52) operable to store data (see fig. 7, par. 0069 lines 9-10); and a display control unit (40) operable to read the data stored in the storage unit (52) and display the data on the first display screen (5) with a device main body in an opened state, and read the same data

and display the data on the second display screen (**20**) with the device main body in a closed state (**see fig. 7, pars. 0086 and 0091-0093**).

Consider claim 2, Nakamura discloses a screen size of the second display screen is smaller than a screen size of the first display screen (see par. 0107 lines 3-5).

Consider claim 3, Nakamura discloses a detection unit (**49**) operable to detect whether the device main body is in the opened state or the closed state, wherein the display control unit (**40**) includes a first storage subunit (**42**) that corresponds to the screen size of the first display screen (**5**), and a second storage subunit (**48**) that corresponds to the screen size of the second display screen (**20**), when a notification of the opened state is received from the detection unit (**49**), the display control unit (**40**) reads, from the storage unit (**52**), a desired web page which is the data, develops the web page to the first storage subunit (**42**) as bitmap data, and displays the bitmap data on the first display screen (**5**), and when a notification of the closed state is received from the detection unit (**49**), the display control unit (**40**) reads the desired web page from the storage unit (**52**), develops the web page to the second storage subunit (**48**) as bitmap data, and displays the bitmap data on the second display screen (**20**) (**see fig. 7, pars. 0086 and 0091-0094 – an image is data, which reads on the web page and bitmap**).

Consider claim 4, Nakamura discloses wherein the display control unit sets a size of a character that is to be developed to the first storage subunit as bitmap data to a size specified by display information of the data stored in the storage unit , and changes a size of a character that is to be developed to the second storage subunit as bitmap data to a minimum size specified by the display information (see par. 0107 lines 9-12).

Consider claim 6, Nakamura discloses wherein when a size of an image to be developed to the second storage subunit as bitmap data is larger than a size of the second storage subunit, the display control unit reduces the image to a size that can be held in the second storage subunit (see par. 0107 lines 9-12).

Consider claim 9, this is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 1. Therefore, it has been analyzed and rejected based upon the apparatus claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. (US 20040023685 A1), hereafter “Nakamura,” in view of Kurashina et al. (US 5947619 A), hereafter “Kurashina.”

Consider claim 5, Nakamura discloses claim 4 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the size specified by the display information is one of 36x36 dot, 26x26 dot, 18x18 dot, and 12x12 dot, and the minimum size is 12x12 dot.

Kurashina teaches wherein the size specified by the display information is one of 36x36 dot, 26x26 dot, 18x18 dot, and 12x12 dot, and the minimum size is 12x12 dot (see fig. 18, col. 24 lines 30-39).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Nakamura and have it include wherein the size specified by the display information is one of 36x36 dot, 26x26 dot, 18x18 dot, and 12x12 dot, and the minimum size is 12x12 dot, as taught by Kurashina. The motivation would have been in order to adjust the size of the image as require by the displaying screen (see fig. 18, col. 24 lines 30-39).

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. (US 20040023685 A1), hereafter “Nakamura,” in view of Taniguchi et al. (US 20040058715 A1), hereafter “Taniguchi.”

Consider claim 7, Nakamura discloses claim 1 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the data stored in the storage unit is web page content of a website, the content being acquired via a public network.

Taniguchi teaches wherein the data stored in the storage unit is web page content of a website, the content being acquired via a public network (see par. 0084 lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Nakamura and have it include wherein the data stored in the storage unit is web page content of a website, the content being acquired via a public network, as taught by Taniguchi. The motivation would have been in order to facilitate the sharing of images (see par. 0116).

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. (US 20040023685 A1), hereafter “Nakamura,” in view of Taniguchi et al. (US 20040058715 A1), hereafter “Taniguchi,” and further in view of Okuzako et al. (US 20040116167 A1), hereafter “Okuzako.”

Consider claim 8, Nakamura as modified by Taniguchi teaches claim 7, but neither Nakamura nor Taniguchi particular refer to wherein a five-point contact key for specifying a link in data displayed on the second display screen is provided on a same surface as the second display screen.

Okuzako teaches wherein a five-point contact key for specifying a link in data displayed on the second display screen is provided on a same surface as the second display screen (see figs. 1 and 2, par. 0105).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Nakamura as modified by Taniguchi and have it include wherein a five-point contact key for specifying a link in data displayed on the second display screen is provided on a same surface as the second display screen, as taught by Okuzako. The motivation would have been in order to allow the user to operate the mobile device even when it is in the closed state (see figs. 1 and 2, par. 0105).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marcos Batista, whose telephone number is (571) 270-5209. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Lun-Yi Lao can be reached at (571) 272-7671. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Marcos Batista
/M. B./
04/17/2008

/LUN-YI LAO/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4134